

## **Amendment 3965—Ensures that there are no adverse effect of a National Heritage Area designation to local communities and home owners**

S. 2483 authorizes the creation of three new National Heritage Areas (NHAs), increases the funding of eight existing “temporary authorizations,” modifies five existing NHA authorizations, and initiates two studies for the creation of new NHAs.

No one is entirely certain what the impact of an NHA designation has on communities and private property.

The amendment simply requires that before any of the new NHA designations take effect, the federal government must determine that the designation will not cause an adverse impact in the area on:

- 1) agricultural and livestock production;
- 2) energy exploration and production;
- 3) critical infrastructure including electric transmission and distribution lines and natural gas pipelines; and
- 4) the affordability of housing.

There must also not be a National Park Service maintenance backlog costing more than \$50 million in the state where the NHA is intended to be located.

These conditions for the creation of new NHAs ensure that the local community and other federally managed parks are not negatively impacted by the designation. These are commonsense considerations that the Senate should have examined before passing this bill. This amendment protects those affected by the NHAs in this bill by ensuring that these issues are explored and resolved before the designation becomes effective.

## **National Heritage Areas Are Proliferating Around The Country**

The National Heritage Areas program was created in 1984, and 27 of them were designated through 2005. But last year, another 10 regions received the distinction. Six more were approved by the House of last fall.<sup>1</sup>

S. 2483 authorizes the creation of three new National Heritage Areas (NHAs), increases the funding of eight existing “temporary authorizations,” modifies five existing NHA authorizations, and initiates two studies for the creation of new NHAs.

In addition to this bill, there have been about 30 bills introduced in this Congress to create or study the creation of new NHAs.

Advertised as a temporary jump start to local preservation efforts, no NHA has ever weaned itself of federal funding. According to the National Park Service, “So far, no area has ‘graduated’ from the program, even after 20 years in some cases and nearly \$100 million invested overall.”<sup>2</sup>

According to the National Park Service, “a ‘national heritage area’ is a place designated by the United States Congress where natural, cultural, historic and recreational resources combine to form a cohesive, nationally-distinctive landscape arising from patterns of human activity shaped by geography. These areas tell nationally important stories about our nation and are representative of the national experience through both the physical features that remain and the traditional that have evolved within them.”<sup>3</sup>

In layman’s terms, NHAs are federally imposed designations that facilitate the establishment of a single local or regional effort to lead land use and preservation efforts. The local entity is guided by the National Park Service and is a conduit for federal funding, although NHAs may raise additional non-federal funds. Because NHAs are

---

<sup>1</sup> Paul Kane. “Heritage Areas vs. Property Rights; With Designations on Rise, Conservatives Sound Alarm,” Washington Post, November 30, 2007, Page A21.

<sup>2</sup> [http://energy.senate.gov/hearings/testimony.cfm?id=1128&wit\\_id=169](http://energy.senate.gov/hearings/testimony.cfm?id=1128&wit_id=169)

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageareas/FAQ/INDEX.HTM>

created for a narrow special interest, heritage areas are often a favorite target for Congressional earmarks.

While NHAs often find support among tourism officials, they have much deeper roots in an ideological movement intended to shift away from the traditional national parks concept to a living, breathing parks/preservation model.

An article published in a 1994 National Park Service newsletter notes that NHA's "represent a sea change in traditional notions of parks and historic preservation."

The newsletter states "heritage areas are an outgrowth of the environmental age, a time for sustaining rather than exploiting resources and pursuing the consumption based development model. Heritage area planning is holistic, resource based, and in keeping with the idea that the people's true heritage is the entire Earth."

"Parks," the article notes, "have been separate and apart from working and residential landscapes and a product of pastoral myth. To now say that a park may be a city or region is disorienting to say the least. But what is happening."<sup>4</sup>

The first National Heritage Area designation occurred in 1984 and relatively few followed for the next decade. However since 2000 Congress has doubled the number of NHAs.<sup>5</sup> As Congress caters more to this very vocal special interest, the constituency for the program is growing. In fact, heritage areas were the subject of 27 earmarks last year alone<sup>6</sup>.

Advertised as a temporary jump-start for "local" preservation efforts, NHAs have taken on a far more permanent status. In fact, initial ten year authorizations have been extended by an additional **15 years** in most cases.

---

<sup>4</sup> "The Heritage Area Phenomenon: Where is it Coming From?" Paul Bray. Cultural Resource Management, Volume 17, No. 8 1994, p3.

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageareas/VST/INDEX.HTM>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2007/11/29/AR2007112902160.html>

While it is clear that heritage area designations are driven by narrow special interest, Congress owes it to taxpayers and property owners to properly consider the real impact NHAs will have on their homes, neighborhoods, and communities.

### **National Heritage Area Designation Can Have Significant Consequences For Communities And Landowners**

The establishment of NHA can have real impacts on communities and private property owners.

The potential consequences of these areas include restrictive zoning laws, government oversight of private property management, and even federal acquisition of land. There are also costs to manage the NHA.

When the National Park Service and local managing entities are given authority over land, the first action is often the enactment of restrictive zoning laws. Although a private citizen may still own the land within a National Heritage Area, the ability to decide how to use the land may be compromised. Landowners could, for example, be forbidden from making basic decisions, such as whether or not trees can be cut down or whether certain crops may be planted.

More restrictions on land owners' use of their own private property, ultimately, is the goal for many of the public organizations that manage National Heritage Areas. The ability to "coordinate" local land use is one of the foremost goals of NHAs.

National Heritage Areas exist almost exclusively to "coordinate" local land use decisions within their borders. The strongest evidence can be found in the plans of the NHAs, all approved by the National Park Service.

- The Blackstone River Valley National Heritage Corridor Management Plan states that "corridor wide policies for land use management are critical." The plan says to achieve "better land use," the "commission will be a strong voice for local land use

planning and regulatory measures.” It also commits to working “to enact ordinances that preserve open spaces.”<sup>7</sup>

- The Lehigh and Delaware Canal National Heritage Corridor Management Plan states “careful land management will encourage well designed development in appropriate places, lessening the homogenization caused by urban sprawl.”<sup>8</sup>

The Journey Through Hallowed Ground Heritage Area authorized in this bill has already hired a local land use consultant who will work with state and local governments to achieve its vision of ideal land use ordinances. “The Alexandria, VA, office of EDAW, Inc., the international land-based planning and design firm, is providing advice on planning and design issues related to the future development of JTHG (Journey Through Hallowed Ground NHA), and attending meetings with local and state agencies to help facilitate discussion of planning issues.”<sup>9</sup>

National Heritage Area land use plans impact the decisions of local planners. The National Heritage Area Comprehensive Plan for the city of Wheeling, West Virginia illustrates the use of zoning and regulation by NHAs:

“Key recommendations of the plan include...the institution of a viable historic conservation strategy to preserve the essence of the City’s historic heritage (as described and adopted in the Wheeling National Heritage Area Plan). This strategy should include expanded use of historic zoning districts that include measures to regulate building renovation and demolition as well as the design characteristics of new development.”<sup>10</sup>

Clearly, the strategy of some National Heritage Areas include greater regulation of land use within a community and that regulation is the result of a few unelected individuals rather than the consensus of those living within the community.

---

<sup>7</sup> [http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online\\_books/blac/chlm.pdf](http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/blac/chlm.pdf) p 62

<sup>8</sup> [http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online\\_books/heritage/dele.pdf](http://www.nps.gov/history/history/online_books/heritage/dele.pdf) p 32

<sup>9</sup> <http://www.hallowedground.org/content/view/162/12/>

<sup>10</sup> Wheeling Comprehensive Plan - 1997 Update, p. 2

A Government Accountability Office (GAO) report noted that the “groups who we contacted were unable to provide us with any examples of a heritage area directly affecting--positively or negatively--private property use.<sup>11</sup>”

The GAO, unfortunately, did not independently review the impact of NHAs, analyze any changes in local zoning resulting from NHA designation, or interview local property owners.

### **The Senate Has Not Fully Examined The Impact Of The NHA Designations Contained Within This Bill On Local Communities**

NHAs do not buy or regulate property. NHAs instead operate as federally funded organizations that work to achieve these goals indirectly by encouraging local governments to implement restrictive land use plans.

There has been no examination by any Senate Committee of the impact of NHA designation.

An NHA could impact zoning or land use regulations in local communities, affecting the affordability of housing, electric distribution, and farm land use.

Adding NHA designations to the management responsibilities of the National Park Service could also affect the agency’s allocation of resources and priority setting.

These issues have not been examined in regard to the authorizations contained within S. 2483.

Additionally, there is no real Congressional Budget Office (CBO) score of S. 2483 to determine the overall cost of the bill. The CBO score provided only examined “direct spending” and ignored the hundreds of millions of dollars in new spending authorized by the bill.

---

<sup>11</sup> [http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageareas/LEG/gao\\_report.pdf](http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageareas/LEG/gao_report.pdf)

This is another Washington shell game used by Congress to hide its uncontrollable spending habits from the public.

The Senate—which determines NHA designation—does not even consider such decisions important enough to debate. The NHAs established by S. 2483 were all intended to be “hotlined,” approved by the Senate without discussion or a vote, except a lone Senator objected and demanded a full and open debate on the matter.

If the Senate chooses to pass legislation without careful consideration of its potential impact, the executive branch should be required to evaluate these matters and ensure that at the very least those Americans who live within a community that is intended to be part of a NHA are not adversely impacted.

Federally imposed preservation and land use restriction efforts cover large territories, often extending through several states. One federal heritage area covers an entire state. Given the vast areas encompassed, the lack of criteria for designating these areas, and the distinct potential for shifts in land use policy, the federal government must ensure that critical sectors of infrastructure, such as the distribution of electric or the production of energy, are not negatively impacted.

Advocates claim that National Heritage Areas have no *direct* impact on these sectors. Federal land policies should be made based upon careful examination of the facts and objective studies, not on the assurances of advocacy groups and lobbyists.

Furthermore, the bill itself empowers NHA management entities to exert influence over a community’s land use.

S. 2483 requires the National Park Service to ensure the completion of “an inventory of the natural, historical, cultural, educational, scenic, and recreational resources of the National Heritage Area related to the national importance and themes of the National Heritage Area that should be protected, enhanced, interpreted, managed, funded, and developed.” In other words, an entity must perform an exhaustive inventory of properties within the area for the federal government.

S. 2483 directs the heritage area management entity to focus on land use controls. The legislation specifically requires the local NHA management entity to incorporate “resource protection, enhancement, interpretation, funding, management, and development” into its management plan. The primary instrument for all of these activities is zoning.

During the 109<sup>th</sup> Congress, the House Resources Committee acknowledged this point. In reviewing the impact of the Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area designation, the Committee noted with concern that “The fear of adverse impacts on private property rights were realized when local government agencies began to use the immense heritage area boundary to determine zoning restrictions.”<sup>12</sup>

Federal funds, clearly, should not be used to finance special interest groups to influence local zoning boards to restrict the land use in communities within a NHA.

Home owners and local businesses are disadvantaged if the NHA management entity is bankrolled by the federal government along with special interest groups to enact zoning rules limit the use of land within a community.

### **Federal Bureaucracies Use National Heritage Areas Designations To Promote Lands Controls**

In providing an example of management plans for others to follow, the National Park Service highlights a strategy that calls on NHAs to “support sustainable land use, open space, and greenway planning and preservation.”<sup>13</sup>

The National Parks Advisory Board states that “emerging and designated National Heritage Areas benefit from the National Park Service’s expertise and provide a stronger vehicle for Congress to

---

<sup>12</sup> Report 109-294, November 15, 2005, p2.

<sup>13</sup> <http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageareas/REP/notebook.pdf>, page 29

effectively utilize the National Park Service to achieve publicly supported conservation and preservation.<sup>14</sup>”

It also notes, “The National Heritage Area approach, with its networks of relationships and ability to leverage resources, can serve as a model for achieving National Park Service conservation goals.” The Board does not say “as a model for *locally* supported goals.”

Decisions regarding a home owner’s or a community’s land use should not be made to meet the goals of Washington, DC bureaucrats or politicians, regardless of how well intentioned they may be.

### **National Heritage Area Advocacy Groups Dismiss The Rights Of Home Owners And Promote Laws To Restrict Private Land Use**

“NHAs are perhaps best regarded as a clever combination of pork-barrel spending and land-use regulations—and they’re an increasingly popular too for slow growth activist who bristle at the thought of economic development,” according to *National Review*.<sup>15</sup>

NHA advocates encourage local governments to implement restrictive land-use plans.

The National Trust for Historic Preservation is a leading Washington DC advocacy group for NHAs and also a member of the board of the proposed Journey Through Hallowed Ground NHA authorized in this bill).

In a publication entitled, “Smart Growth Tools for Main Street,” National Trust for Historic Preservation claims that “too often, property rights are misunderstood. Some people erroneously believe that property rights are absolute.”

It also notes that: “Sensible land-use laws almost always enhance, rather than depress, property values.”<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> <http://www.nps.gov/history/heritageareas/NHAreport.pdf>

<sup>15</sup> John J. Miller. “An Ugly Heritage,” *National Review*, January 28, 2008, pages 28-29.

<sup>16</sup> [http://www.nationaltrust.org/smartgrowth/toolkit\\_propertyrights.pdf](http://www.nationaltrust.org/smartgrowth/toolkit_propertyrights.pdf)

Specific to one of the authorizations in this bill, the National Trust's President said "Without comprehensive planning to manage sprawl and encourage appropriate growth, much of the region's heritage could be paved over."<sup>17</sup>

Those are decisions that should be made by community residents rather than DC advocates, bureaucrats and politicians. Restricting land use can increase housing costs and hurt local economies.

Federally designated NHAs should not serve as conduits for special interest advocacy groups to impose land use restrictions and restrict the rights of home owners.

### **The Creation Of New Heritage Areas Siphons Resources Away From Existing Parks And National Treasures**

Dwight Pitcaithley, who served as chief historian for the Park Service from 1995 to 2005, has noted that "While Congress is enamored with the idea of new parks, it has never felt obligated to support those parks with adequate and consistent funding."<sup>18</sup>

This amendment will ensure that before Congress authorizes millions of dollars more to support new parks or heritage areas, the needs of existing national parks in a state are taken into account.

NHAs are not actually owned by the federal government, but they are funded by the Department of Interior, which is responsible for national parks.

While Congress expands the number of NHAs it siphons funds away from the National Park Service which operates almost 400 sites. The Park Service is spending more money per visitor, per acre, and per employee than ever before. Yet, the Department of Interior is having trouble maintaining the properties it actually runs. Its maintenance backlog is a multibillion dollar list of unfunded repairs and

---

<sup>17</sup> <http://www.hallowedground.org/content/view/129/12/>

<sup>18</sup> <http://www.nationalparkstraveler.com/2007/09/will-centennial-launch-national-park-service-toward-greatness>

improvements. The National Parks Conversation Association says that the parks need an extra \$800 million a year to fund their existing operations adequately.<sup>19</sup>

Direct NHA funding is \$15.3 million<sup>20</sup> for the current fiscal year. The Government Accountability Office calculated that NHAs received \$154 million in federal funds between 1997 and 2004.

John Cosgrove, head of the Alliance of National Heritage Areas, an association that represents the groups overseeing the areas, believes that Congress should increase funding so that most of the areas would receive \$1 million a year.<sup>21</sup>

Every dollar directed towards heritage areas is a dollar that is taken away from the immediate needs of existing national parks.

Clearly, taking tens of millions of dollars away from National Parks to fund the creation of new heritage areas is unwise when the parks can not keep up with existing needs and may actually endanger some of our nation's true natural and historic treasures.

In the recently passed omnibus appropriations act, the National Park Service received \$2 billion for operations of the agency,<sup>22</sup> up from \$1.7 billion in Fiscal Year 2007. The NPS is receiving record funding, yet the cost of its maintenance backlog continues to climb along with its responsibilities assigned by Congress.

The National Park Service estimates its deferred maintenance backlog at between \$6 and \$12 billion.<sup>23</sup> This is a steep increase from the \$4.25 billion estimated in Fiscal Year 1999<sup>24</sup>.

A recent memo prepared by the Facility Management Division of the National Park Service reveals at least 10 states where NPS maintenance backlogs exceed \$100 million. At least twenty states

---

<sup>19</sup> John J. Miller. "An Ugly Heritage," National Review, January 28, 2008, page 30.

<sup>20</sup> <http://www.congress.gov/erp/rl/pdf/RL33462.pdf>

<sup>21</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Text of HR 2764, signed by President Bush December 26, 2007.

<sup>23</sup> [http://www.doi.gov/pfm/bur\\_annual\\_rpt/index.html](http://www.doi.gov/pfm/bur_annual_rpt/index.html)

<sup>24</sup> <http://www.congress.gov/erp/rl/pdf/FL33484.pdf>

have facilities with deferred maintenance exceeding \$50 million<sup>25</sup>. These numbers exclude nearly \$5 billion in parks roads facing serious deferred maintenance costs.

The national park maintenance backlog includes:

The National Park Service has 31 sites in **California** and faces a total state backlog of \$584 million (excluding road maintenance needs). The state is home such national treasures as Yosemite, Golden Gate Recreation Area and Sequoia National Park.

**New York** national parks facilities face a \$347 million backlog. New York is home to Ellis Island and the Statue of Liberty. Statue of Liberty Park faces a \$185 million maintenance backlog.<sup>26</sup>

National Park in **Wyoming** face \$205 million maintenance backlog. Sites include Yellowstone, Grand Teton National Park and Devils Tower. Yellowstone faces a \$130 million maintenance backlog.

In **Montana**, Glacier National Park faces a staggering maintenance backlog of \$400 million, including the stabilization of historic structures.<sup>27</sup>

There is a \$371 million backlog in **Washington, DC**, home to our nation's most treasured memorials to our nation's greatest leaders and those who fought and sacrificed to protect our liberty and democratic ideals.

**New Mexico**, which has 16 national parks sites, faces a \$41 million backlog (excluding roads). Sites include Carlsbad Caverns, White Sands and many ancient Indian ruin sites. At Carlsbad, maintenance needs were so pressing that sewer lines were actually leaking into the historic caves. Carlsbad superintendent Benjamin said: "Believe me, if there's sewage dripping down into that cavern, people are not going to believe we're doing a good job."<sup>28</sup> At the time of his

---

<sup>25</sup> December 11, 2007 Summary for Congressional Research Service: NPS Asset Management Challenge

<sup>26</sup> Ibid.

<sup>27</sup> [http://www.npca.org/what\\_we\\_do/visitor\\_experience/backlog/maintenance.html](http://www.npca.org/what_we_do/visitor_experience/backlog/maintenance.html)

<sup>28</sup> NATIONAL PARKS FAST FALLING INTO DISREPAIR: From aging facilities to overgrown trails, reaching the backcountry is getting harder. May 25, 2004 <http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/0525/p01s02-usgn.html>

statement less than four years ago, he had three more miles of sewer line to repair or replace. As for New Mexico's other National Park sites, Benjamin says "you'll hear the same song from all of them, maybe a different verse." According to an analysis on the maintenance backlog crisis within the National Park Service, "Ancient stone structures are collapsing at Chaco Culture National Historical Park in New Mexico<sup>29</sup>."

**Arizona**, home to the Grand Canyon, faces a backlog of \$192 million. A leading parks advocacy group places the Petrified Forest National Park among the most ten most endangered parks in America.<sup>30</sup> The maintenance backlog at the Grand Canyon—considered one of the "seven wonders of the world" faces a deferred maintenance backlog of \$121 million.<sup>31</sup>

In the states—**Pennsylvania, Maryland, and Virginia**—included in the Journey Through Hallowed Ground National Heritage Area designated in this bill, the NPS faces a combined backlog of \$572 million (again excluding roads maintenance). Those states include important national parks sites including Gettysburg and Antietam Battlefield. Gettysburg faces a \$15 million maintenance backlog and Antietam has a \$22 million backlog. In total, the three states face a National Park maintenance backlog of \$573 million.

### **Deferred Maintenance Backlog Costs By State**

---

<sup>29</sup> NATIONAL PARKS FAST FALLING INTO DISREPAIR: From aging facilities to overgrown trails, reaching the backcountry is getting harder. May 25, 2004 <http://www.csmonitor.com/2004/0525/p01s02-usgn.html>

<sup>30</sup> [http://www.npca.org/media\\_center/press\\_releases/2001/page-27598999.html](http://www.npca.org/media_center/press_releases/2001/page-27598999.html)

<sup>31</sup> January 17, 2008 "CRS Paper Follow to Senator Coburn" Prepared by the National Park Service

Figure 3.

State	DM	State	DM	State	DM
AK	\$ 67,142,000	MD	\$ 218,255,000	RI	\$ 1,051,000
AL	\$ 11,031,000	ME	\$ 23,467,000	SC	\$ 24,916,000
AR	\$ 47,755,000	MI	\$ 47,238,000	SD	\$ 22,831,000
AZ	\$ 192,602,000	MN	\$ 7,920,000	TN	\$ 25,789,000
CA	\$ 584,745,000	MO	\$ 44,310,000	TX	\$ 66,911,000
CO	\$ 108,160,000	MS	\$ 4,333,000	UT	\$ 59,234,000
CT	\$ 5,760,000	MT	\$ 67,718,000	VA	\$ 190,790,000
DE		NC	\$ 90,955,000	VT	\$ 389,000
FL	\$ 130,882,000	ND	\$ 3,972,000	WA	\$ 69,878,000
GA	\$ 43,842,000	NE	\$ 3,704,000	WI	\$ 11,942,000
HI	\$ 89,219,000	NH	\$ 5,065,000	WV	\$ 94,224,000
IA	\$ 5,817,000	NJ	\$ 54,353,000	WY	\$ 205,929,000
ID	\$ 3,620,000	NM	\$ 41,480,000		
IL	\$ 3,248,000	NV	\$ 65,193,000	DC	\$ 371,221,000
IN	\$ 27,685,000	NY	\$ 346,473,000	PR	\$ 346,753,000
KS	\$ 6,378,000	OH	\$ 30,423,000	Other	
KY	\$ 36,798,000	OK	\$ 12,782,000	Territories	\$ 62,095,000
LA	\$ 15,798,000	OR	\$ 27,745,000		
MA	\$ 95,804,000	PA	\$ 162,910,000		

Above table does not include roads DM of \$4,411,495,000 as this information is captured separately by FHWA

## **National Heritage Area Lobbies To Create New Federal Parks**

National Heritage Areas use their resources to influence federal policy makers into increasing other federal commitments.

For instance, one NHAs brags:

“Rivers of Steel is spearheading a drive to create a national park on 38 acres of the original mill site that that would include the Carrie Furnaces, the Pump House, and Water Tower. Bills have been introduced before the U S Congress to make this urban National Park a reality.

"Plans for the National Park include a series of walkways to be built around the Carrie Furnaces giving visitors the opportunity to walk in and around the furnaces that tower 92 feet above ground. The Pump House will tell the story of the 1892 Battle of Homestead that was waged between strikers and Pinkerton guards. Nearby, the Bost Building, which played a historic role in the strike, will house an exhibit on the union movement. Help us in our efforts to create this National Park. Register your support and add your name to a letter of

support now!”<sup>32</sup>

### **This Amendment Protects National Parks, Local Businesses, Home Owners, And Others Who Live Within NHAs**

The land use restrictions advocated for preservation within a NHA can result in higher land values, higher property taxes, and higher energy costs. This can mean less affordable housing, which in turns can drive low and middle income Americans out of the communities and neighborhoods where they now reside. It can hinder local economic growth, which means fewer jobs.

To protect against these potential adverse effects, this amendment requires that before a proposed National Heritage Area receives its official designation, the President must certify that the will have no adverse impact on:

- **Agricultural and livestock production**— Our nation depends on a safe and abundant food supply.
- **Energy exploration and production**—Our nation faces an energy crisis in large part because of foreign energy dependence.
- **Critical infrastructure**, including electric transmission and natural gas lines—Our nation faces a growing bottleneck in transmission capacity that is threatening to increase consumer costs and that could lead to large scale blackouts. Natural gas is the cleanest burning fuel for the production of electricity and the heating of homes, and the ability to transport it effectively will determine its success and positive environmental impact.
- **Affordable housing**—Home owners and renters face growing challenges. Where a family lives can determine the quality of the schools their children attend, the safety of their neighborhoods, and the opportunities available to succeed in securing the American Dream.

---

<sup>32</sup> <http://www.riversofsteel.com/subpage.aspx?id=23&h=222&sn=252>

The American public deserves the assurance that the federal government will carefully measure the impact of a proposed NHA on their homes and communities to ensure that there will be no negative consequences before such a designation is approved.

### Sample of Maintenance Backlog as identified by the National Parks Conservation Association

- Washington's Mount Rainier National Park has a backlog in excess of \$100 million—half of which is road repair. Hikers cannot get to backcountry cabins because bridges and trails leading to the buildings are in disrepair.
- At Dry Tortugas National Park in South Florida, large sections of a historic lighthouse and Fort Jefferson—the largest all-masonry fortification in North America—are structurally unsafe. Fort Jefferson once held one of the nation's most famous prisoners: Dr. Samuel Mudd, the doctor who set John Wilkes Booth's leg, injured as the actor escaped from Ford's Theatre after assassinating President Lincoln.
- The visitor center at the USS Arizona Memorial in Hawaii is sinking and may cost as much as \$20 million to repair—a cost that exceeds the entire annual budget for the seven national park sites in the state.
- Yosemite National Park has more than \$40 million worth of backlog projects, including trail and campground maintenance, sewer system replacement, and electrical upgrades.
- The South Rim of Grand Canyon National Park in Arizona houses numerous buildings designed by Mary Elizabeth Jane Colter, an architect whose work reflects Native American influences. Most of these structures, from the Hopi House to the Bright Angel Lodge, are on the National Register of Historic Landmarks but lack funds for preservation. These projects are counted among \$60 million worth of backlog maintenance at the park.
- The \$20-million maintenance backlog at Big South Fork National River and Recreation Area in Tennessee is affected by annual operating shortfalls that limit the Park Service's ability to hire any seasonal employees this summer to help with maintenance.
- Ancient stone structures are literally collapsing at Chaco Culture National Historical Park in New Mexico.
- At Yellowstone, 150 miles of roads have not been repaired in years, and many of the park's several hundred buildings, including those used to house park employees, are in woeful condition.
- Glacier's backlog of deferred maintenance needs exceeds \$400 million. The total includes \$10 million to construct a new west-side visitor center, more than \$150 million to stabilize historic hotels, and about \$150 million to rehabilitate historic Going-to-the-Sun Road.
- The administration estimates that road and bridge rehabilitation in Alaska's national parks will cost more than \$27 million over the next six years.